



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/016,529

12/10/2001

Scott Alan Beckwith

8285-479

1269

757

7590

01/25/2006

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

P.O. BOX 10395

CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LAN DAI T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/016,529	Applicant(s) BECKWITH ET AL.	
	Examiner lan dai thi truong	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/19/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim rejections-35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter such as “oversight controller” which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The correction is requested.

Claim rejections-35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1) Claims 1-2 6-9, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pedersen et al. (U.S. 5,826,027), “Pedersen”, herein after.

Regarding to claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, and 12-15:

Art Unit: 2143

Pedersen discloses a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for code for selectively updating the databases of the first and second service control points comprising comprising:

Receiving an update request message developed pursuant to a third protocol: abstract, lines 1-15, column 1, lines 29-41; column 6, lines 1-20

Identifying the update request message as being directed to the first service control point: abstract, lines 1-15, column 1, lines 29-41; column 6, lines 1-20

Translating the update request message from the third protocol to the first protocol: (modifying protocol parameter: abstract: lines 1-18)

Delivering the translated update request message to the first network element manager: (updating and mainlining prioritized protocol list: abstract, lines 1-15, column 1, lines 29-41; column 6, lines 1-20)

Regarding to claim 4:

Pedersen discloses a method as discuss in claim1, which further includes permitting a customer to input an update request message via the Internet: (Lan/Wan: figure 1, items 300, 302, 304, 305)

Regarding to claim 16:

Pedersen discloses a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for code for selectively updating the databases of the first and second service control points comprising:

An input device for receiving a request message: (“server” which is equivalent to “input device”: abstract, lines 1-15)

A processor in communication with the input device and the first network element manager for developing an indication of a status of a service at a predefined time in response to the request message: ("server" which must includes a processor to execute operations such as protocol translation: abstract, lines 1-15; column 6, lines 1-24)

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 10-11, 17, 20-21, 25-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Pedersen in view of Sawyer et al. (U.S. 6,058,115)

Regarding to claims 3 and 10-11:

Pedersen discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claims 1 and 6, but does not explicitly teach wherein the second protocol is identical to the third protocol:

However, **Sawyer discloses** a common protocol existing between the two subscriber units: abstract: lines 1-18

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Sawyer's** ideas of identifying common protocol in prioritized protocol list with Pedersen's system in order to optimize the establishing connection process

Regarding to claims 21, which is exemplary with claim 25-26, 28-31:

Pedersen discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for processing update request messages requesting modifications to an advanced intelligent network employing service control points having network element managers, the system comprising:

At least one message receiver for receiving update request messages: (“server” which is equivalent to “message receiver”: abstract, lines 1-16; column 6, lines 1-24)

A first primary controller for processing update request messages requesting modifications relating to a first business function of the advanced intelligent network: (the communication between plurality of servers and plurality of workstations. “Server” which is equivalent to “first primary controller” figure 1, items 300, 302, 304, 305; column 1, lines 29-42; column 6, lines 1-24)

a second primary controller for processing update request messages requesting modifications relating to a second business function of the advanced intelligent network: (the communication between plurality of servers and plurality of workstations. “Server” which is equivalent to “second primary controller” figure 1, items 300, 302, 304, 305; column 1, lines 29-42; column 6, lines 1-24)

However, Pedersen does not explicitly disclose at least one system flow controller interfacing with the at least one message receiver and with at least one of the first and second primary controllers for managing the first and second primary controllers to process update request messages received by the at least one message receiver and at least one translator

Art Unit: 2143

associated with at least one service control point for translating the processed update request messages into a format usable by the network element manager of the service control point

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sawyer's ideas of identifying common protocol in prioritized protocol list and translating protocol at gateways or satellite with Pedersen's system in order to optimize protocol translation process

Regarding to claims 17 and 20:

Pedersen discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 16, but does not explicitly teach a local database duplicating data indicating the status of predefined services stored in the SCP database

However, Sawyer discloses the "gateway memory" which is equivalent to "local database" for storing the prioritized protocol list which is sent from subscriber: abstract, lines 1-15; column 6, lines 55-67)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sawyer's ideas of identifying common protocol in prioritized protocol list or translating protocol at gateways or satellite with Pedersen's system in order to optimize protocol translation process

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Pedersen-Sawyer in view of Rekhter et al. (U.S. 6,339,595)

Regarding to claims 18-19:

Pedersen-Sawyer discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 17, but does not explicitly teach wherein the processor manages the size of the local database by periodically deleting stale data

However, Rekhter discloses router discard the session within the certain timeout period: column 15, lines 30-40.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rekhter's ideas of discarding the session within the certain timeout period at router with Pedersen's system in order to save memory.

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Pedersen-Sawyer in view of Vaudreuil et al. (U.S. 5,940,478)

Regarding to claims 22-23:

Pedersen-Sawyer discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 21, but does not explicitly teach wherein the at least one message receiver comprises an audio response receiver for receiving update request messages in an audio response unit format from an audio response unit; wherein the audio response receiver is adapted to translate received update request messages from the audio response unit format to a format which is understandable to the first and second primary controllers and to the at least one system flow controller.

However, Vaudreuil discloses the method for translating communication protocol in order to create compatible protocol using for transmitting "voice message" which is equivalent to "audio message" over a hub is executed the protocol translating and maintained the prioritized protocol list for future use: column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67)

Art Unit: 2143

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vaudreuil's ideas of translating and maintaining communication protocols in hub with Pedersen-Sawyer's system in order to optimize protocol translation process

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Pedersen-Sawyer-Vaudreuil in view of Wong et al. (U.S. 6,260,021)

Regarding to claims 22-23:

Pedersen-Sawyer- Vaudreuil discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 23, but does not explicitly teach wherein the understandable format comprises CORBA IIOP

However, Wong disclose CORBA IIOP used as standard protocol: column 7, lines 38-67; column 8, lines 1-67)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wong's ideas of using CORBA IIOP used as standard protocol with Pedersen-Sawyer- Vaudreuil's system in order to provide compatible protocol for image communication system, see (Wong: abstract, lines 1-25)

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Pedersen-Sawyer in view of Wong et al. (U.S. 6,260,021)

Regarding to claim 27:

Pedersen-Sawyer discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 21, but does not explicitly teach wherein the understandable format comprises CORBA IIOP

However, Wong disclose CORBA IIOP used as standard protocol: column 7, lines 38-67; column 8, lines 1-67)

Art Unit: 2143

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wong's ideas of using CORBA IIOP used as standard protocol with Pedersen-Sawyer's system in order to provide compatible protocol for image communication system, see (Wong: abstract, lines 1-25)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Pedersen in view of Todd (U.S. 6,463,418)

Regarding to claim 5:

Pedersen-Sawyer discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach employing a cryptographic technique to restrict access to the first and second control points

However, Todd discloses method of applying SSL for client-server communication: column 6, lines 17-54

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Todd's ideas of applying SSL with Pedersen's system in order to provide secure communication system, see (Todd: column 6, lines 17-54)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.


Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lan Dai Thi Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

Ldt
01/20/2006


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100